

## **APPENDIX 6: MEETING MINUTES**



## **APPENDIX 6: MEETING MINUTES**

---

### **SourcePoint – Caltrans**

November 7, 2002  
December 5, 2002  
February 3, 2003  
April 2, 2003  
April 22, 2003  
June 19, 2003  
July 2, 2003  
July 29, 2003

### **SourcePoint – Caltrans – BGIS**

December 16, 2002  
August 1, 2003

### **BINS Technical Committee**

November 19, 2002  
April 30, 2003  
May 16, 2003  
June 13, 2003  
November 21, 2003

## **SOURCEPOINT – CALTRANS MEETING MINUTES**

### **Dates:**

November 7, 2002

December 5, 2002

February 3, 2003

April 2, 2003

April 22, 2003

June 19, 2003

July 2, 2003

July 29, 2003

## **MINUTES FROM THE SOURCEPOINT – CALTRANS MEETING CONDUCTED NOVEMBER 7, 2002**

### **Goals of Meeting**

There are two main goals for the meeting. The first deals with approving the project management and framework. The second objective is to finalize the administrative details and agenda of the BINS Technical Committee Meeting scheduled for November 19<sup>th</sup>.

### **Discussion**

Regarding Project Management:

- The project's schedule of tasks has been revised in order to more accurately reflect the way the project is being carried out. Caltrans representatives agreed on the creation of this framework and recommended we present it to the JWC in December.

Regarding the BINS Technical Committee Meeting November 19:

- The attendees concluded that the JWC prefers the U.S. approach of evaluating projects on a state-by-state basis and also recognized that the JWC hopes to guide the BINS project in that direction.
- The group agreed on creating evaluation criteria for choosing transportation corridors.
- The Technical Committee and JWC will use these criteria to choose their preferred corridors.

Regarding Evaluation Methodology:

- BINS will compare and assess the corridor criteria, and present the findings to the TWC and JWC.

### **Follow-up**

- Gene Pound will be removed from the list of Caltrans representatives.
- BINS Team will send emails the Mexican States of Tamaulipas and Nuevo León inviting them to the Technical Committee meeting in November.
- Sergio and Lisa will provide comments on:
  - The Transportation Planning Process Technical memo.
  - Current profiles of corridors.

Technical Committee Meeting, November 19

- BINS Meeting with Caltrans Representatives, December 5 @ 9:00 AM
- Joint Working Committee meeting, December 12 & 13, 2002, Baltimore, MD.

### **Attendees**

California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Trent Clark
- Sergio Pallares

SourcePoint

- Marney Cox
- Santiago Dávila
- Oliver Kaplan
- Michael Williams

San Diego Association of Governments

- Elisa Arias

U.S. Federal Highway Administration

- Lisa Dye

## **MINUTES FROM THE SOURCEPOINT – CALTRANS MEETING CONDUCTED DECEMBER 5, 2002**

### **Goals of Meeting**

The main goal for the meeting is to review Marney Cox's [SourcePoint] presentation to the Joint Working Committee (JWC) in Baltimore, Maryland on December 13, 2002. At this meeting, Marney [SourcePoint] will reconfirm the procedure approved by the Technical Committee on November 19, 2002 with the JWC. Also, Marney [SourcePoint] will present the criteria elements for the JWC to agree on.

### **Discussion**

- Regarding the criteria-based procedure:
  - The attendees decided to ask the Joint Working Committee (JWC) whether or not it wants projects to be prioritized.
  - A memo describing the criteria will be created and sent to the JWC and Technical Committee.
- Regarding the criteria:
  - The states will be asked for specific data, including a listing of projects along corridors.
  - Establish two sets of criteria, "minimum criteria" and "quantitative criteria". Minimum criteria will be "Yes/No" responses, and quantitative criteria will ask for numeric values.
  - There was a consensus to integrate multimodal facilities into the study.

### **Follow-up**

- Further develop an objective, uniform system of criteria that all states agree on.
- Create a technical memo to explain why we are using ADT (Average Daily Traffic) as a significant part of the criteria.
- CALTRANS meeting Tuesday, November 10<sup>th</sup> at 10 AM.

### **Attendees**

California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Beth Landrum
- Sergio Pallares

SourcePoint

- Marney Cox
- Santiago Dávila
- Michael Williams

San Diego Association of Governments

- Elisa Arias

US Federal Highway Administration

- Lisa Dye



## **MINUTES FROM THE SOURCEPOINT – CALTRANS MEETING CONDUCTED FEBRUARY 3, 2003**

### **Goals of Meeting**

There are four main goals for the meeting. Most importantly, SourcePoint and Caltrans will review the BINS Questionnaire, and give suggestions and ideas for needed improvements. Secondly, the attendees will decide on a process for the BINS Criteria Approval, followed by an update on GIS Issues related to the project. The final goal of the meeting is to determine which party will pay for the translation of the final report.

### **Discussion**

- Regarding the criteria for the questionnaire:
  - Marney Cox [SourcePoint] explained to Sergio Pallares [California Department of Transportation – Caltrans] that the main intention of SourcePoint is to present a criteria draft to the Technical Committee (agreed on during November's meeting) in order to provide them with something to comment on. In addition to this criteria draft, SourcePoint will present the questionnaire that will be used to collect and analyze the criteria.
  - Sergio [Caltrans] pointed out that it was important to spend some time explaining and justifying the criteria. SourcePoint already has a justification draft started and will use it to "market" the criteria to the Technical Committee. The revised justification, questionnaire, and attached memo will be sent out to the Technical Committee next week.
- The attendees agreed that the cover page on each part of the questionnaire will be reorganized, with all the items that are general information grouped in a box on the top of the page, and the instructions/directions grouped in a box below the general information box
- SourcePoint will provide a tentative list of facilities to all the states. This list is part of the questionnaire.
- Regarding the Corridors section of the questionnaire: Under the example tab, there will be a definition of a "transportation corridor", along with the "100 kilo....." specification. The definition of the corridor will also mention that "...the corridors serve a POE".
  - Surface POE will be changed to Land POE.
  - Water Port will be changed to Maritime POE.
  - For the airport section, on Part 1 (Corridors), the definition will be changed to include the first component "within 100 kilo...", and the second component "must serve as an international POE" for each mode (Maritime Ports, Airports, and Railroads).
  - The second component, airport section, Part 1 (Corridors) will now read "must serve as a POE from goods coming from Mexico to the U.S."
  - SourcePoint will group the railroads and highways on top, as they serve a POE, and group the airports and water modes, as they are designated as POEs.
- Caltrans pointed out the difference between census projections and "SCAG" projections. A source needs to be obtained for either the census or "SCAG" projections of data on the Socio-Economic Tab. Trade forecast will be hard to obtain. Highways may have AADT projections.

However, POE will not have projections. Projections for railroads are private information that will be hard to obtain.

- Regarding Part 2b (Ports of Entry):
  - Under the example tab, number 2 of the minimum criteria will be left out.
  - On Part 2b (POE), add "in calendar year 2000" for number 3 of the Quantifiable criteria.
  - Question # 6, under Quantifiable Criteria on Part 2b passenger vehicles will replace personal vehicles.
  - For questions # 11-16, Part 2b, it will read "Estimate" instead of "Specify"
  - Questionnaire (part 2b) under the rail information needs three things: number of rail cars, number of containers and number of bulk goods.
- Regarding Part 2a (Highways):
  - The allocation of AADT to different corridors (Part 2a) is too difficult. The allocation section of all the questionnaire parts will be left out. Data will be allocated specifically to only one corridor.
  - For the allocation of data from the POEs to the different highways on the U.S. side, a method will be used, where the percentage of AADT in different sections of the 100 KM border line will be used to split/allocate the data from the POE. In other words, the AADT percentage of traffic will serve as a tool for the allocation of POE crossings among the HWYS that serve that specific POE.
- Projected data (2020) will be moved to the side of the historic data.
- Regarding Part 2c (Airports):
  - The specific mode where the cargo is transferred to needs to be collected.
  - A question will be added to the Airport questionnaire (Part 2c), "Is an airport served by a railroad facility?"
  - A question concerning the amount of passengers for Airports will be added IF the Technical Committee sees the need for it.
  - For the questions under the quantifiable criteria for Airports, the place of origin should be added. For example, "Specify the volume of goods [in tons] coming from Mexico and transported at the airport in calendar year 2000...."
- Regarding Part 2e (Maritime Ports):
  - A question will be added to the Maritime Port questionnaire (Part 2e), "Does the Maritime Port serve by a railroad facility?"
  - Minimum criteria question #2 for Maritime Ports will read "Does the maritime port handle goods to/from Mexico and U.S.?"
  - Under the quantifiable criteria for Maritime Ports, channel will be changed to channel(s).
  - Questionnaire (part 2e) under the Maritime Port information, it needs to ask total tons, dollars and what portion of that comes from Mexico (%).
  - Under the Maritime Port questionnaire, the specific mode where the cargo is transferred to needs to be collected.
- Regarding the questionnaire as a whole, the attendees agreed that:
  - "Serve" will be used instead of "directly or indirectly" throughout the entire study.
  - The questionnaire for railroads will be left out. However, the data for international cargo transported by railroads will be captured in the POE tab. Under the POE questionnaire tab,

we have a question that captures the % of cargo transported. A question regarding which corridor each rail line is in will be added to the POE questionnaire tab.

- All the rail line information will be picked up on the other modes.

## **Follow-up**

- The revised justification, questionnaire, and attached memo will be sent out to the Technical Committee next week.
- Caltrans and SourcePoint will discuss translation issues for the remaining parts of the study and the final report.
- Questionnaire will be mailed out to Carlos Lopez [SAHOPE].
- SourcePoint will inform Caltrans of any progress on the BINS use of GIS functions.

## **Attendees**

California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Trent Clark
- Beth Landrum
- Sergio Pallares

SourcePoint

- Marney Cox
- Santiago Dávila
- Amir Masliyah
- Michael Williams

San Diego Association of Governments

- Elisa Arias

U.S. Federal Highway Administration

- Lisa Dye

## **MINUTES FROM SOURCEPOINT – CALTRANS MEETING CONDUCTED APRIL 2, 2003**

### **Goals of Meeting**

There are five main goals for the meeting. SourcePoint will give an overview of progress made thus far, specifically as it relates to questionnaire responses. Also, SourcePoint and Caltrans will review two resolutions concerning corridor evaluation that will be recommended to the Technical Committee for approval. Next, the attendees will examine the steps needed to complete the California Corridor Evaluation and use this example to lead into a review of the Corridor Database System Plan. Finally, the attendees will outline the logistics for the April 25<sup>th</sup> meeting with the Technical Committee.

### **Discussion**

- Regarding SourcePoint's progress with data retrieval:
  - SourcePoint and Caltrans decided on April 11th as a "drop dead" date where no more questionnaire responses will be accepted from the border-states.
  - The attendees decided on utilizing alternate sources of data (HPMS, various websites) to populate the incomplete questionnaires.
- Regarding Resolutions #1 & Resolution #2:
  - Numerous word, phrase, and organizational adjustments were made to the resolutions that will be reflected in the final drafts.
- Regarding the California Corridor Evaluation Example:
  - Caltrans expressed difficulty in providing the evaluation data to SourcePoint by the April 4 deadline, and a new April 11 deadline was created.
  - In order to receive approval of the resolutions from the Technical Committee, members of the meeting expressed the need to show how a corridor evaluation will affect each state via an example evaluation of at least one state (most likely Arizona).
- Regarding the Corridor Database System Plan:
  - An Excel spreadsheet format will be used as the database and evaluation tool for all the border-states.
  - BGIS project data will have GIS coordinates that can be incorporated into the BGIS layers once the BGIS project is completed.
  - A matrix will be created to show the connection between the Binational study and the BINS database.

### **Follow-up**

- The Technical Committee will meet April 30th, (rather than April 25th), and the members that cannot attend in person will be teleconferenced in.
  - The Joint Working Committee will meet in June (rather than in May).

## **Attendees**

### California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Trent Clark
- Beth Landrum
- Sergio Pallares

### SourcePoint

- Marney Cox
- Santiago Dávila
- Amir Masliyah
- Michael Williams

### San Diego Association of Governments

- Elisa Arias

## **MINUTES FROM SOURCEPOINT – CALTRANS MEETING CONDUCTED APRIL 22, 2003**

### **Goals of Meeting**

There are four main goals for the meeting. SourcePoint will give an update and overview of the questionnaire completion results, and SourcePoint will also present alternative solutions for obtaining Mexican data. SourcePoint and Caltrans will review and discuss the strategy to gain approval on the two proposed resolutions (concerning corridor evaluation) from the Technical Committee. Lastly, the attendees will discuss outstanding issues and arrangements for the April 30<sup>th</sup> meeting with the Technical Committee.

### **Discussion**

- Regarding Alternative Solutions for the Mexican Data:
  - SourcePoint will find data for Sonora, Coahuila, and Nuevo Leon from a myriad of sources, and send it to these states for review.
  - A memo will be sent to the Technical Committee and Joint Working Committee summarizing the responses to the questionnaires, and the procedure to supplement the data deficiencies.
  - Options for obtaining projection data include: SCT, locating the sources of the Mexican states that have successfully completed the surveys, and using demographic data to create transportation projections.
- Regarding the Two Corridor Evaluation Resolutions:
  - SourcePoint will not ask for approval on the resolutions until each state has viewed its particular evaluation results (early June timeframe). There will be a three step evaluation presentation process leading up to the vote.
  - The attendees resolved to email the Technical Committee members the following, ASAP: the agenda for the April 30<sup>th</sup> meeting, the resolutions, and the Arizona Corridor Evaluation.
- Regarding the Arizona Corridor Evaluation and the Evaluations in General:
  - SourcePoint will create a written explanation to accompany the corridor evaluations.
  - The “weighting factor” will be clearly displayed in the evaluation spreadsheet and highway maps will be added.
  - Caltrans expressed that the use of the word “ranking” used throughout the evaluation might not accurately convey that corridors within a state are of equal importance. Caltrans stressed that it is the needs and characteristics of these corridors that differ.
  - SourcePoint reassured Caltrans that by weighting projects along corridors, the desires of the transportation official is ultimately the key influencing factor.
  - SourcePoint and Caltrans reached a consensus to change the phrase “corridor ranking” to “evaluation results”.
  - SourcePoint decided to embed a general description of each of the corridors within each state evaluation.

## **Follow-up**

- SourcePoint resolved to tie in the corridors highlighted in the BINS study with the corridors designated “High Priority Corridors” by the U.S. Congress.
- SourcePoint will email the Technical Committee members the details of the April 30th meeting and request questions or issues about the agenda items prior to the meeting.
- There will be a “dry run” of the BINS Technical Committee Meeting April 28th.

## **Attendees**

### California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Sergio Pallares

### SourcePoint

- Marney Cox
- Santiago Dávila
- Amir Masliyah
- Michael Williams

## **MINUTES FROM THE BINS – CALTRANS: JWC PREP MEETING #1 CONDUCTED JUNE 19, 2003**

### **Goals of Meeting**

The purpose of the meeting is to prepare for the Joint Working Committee on July 10-11 in Mexico City.

### **Discussion**

- Regarding the Status of the BINS Project:
  - As of June 19, SourcePoint has received final approval on corridor evaluations for all states except Texas, Tamaulipas, and Chihuahua. Revised corridor evaluations have been sent to Texas and Chihuahua and are awaiting final approval, and the evaluation for Tamaulipas is currently being revised and will be sent out by Wednesday, June 25.
- Regarding transportation projects:
  - The BINS team has received a list of transportation projects from all ten states except Nuevo León. These projects will be compiled into a database and analyzed by the BINS team to gain an idea of funding levels along the different corridors. Also, the JWC will be able to examine project types/levels in order to choose a pilot project for Robert Czerniac's innovative finance study.
- Regarding collateral for the JWC Meeting in July:
  - The attendees decided on furnishing approximately 20 compact discs (with executive summaries on the CD's), 20 executive summaries (paper copies), 75 copies of the PowerPoint presentation, and SourcePoint promotional items.
- Regarding the Presentation Strategy:
  - The attendees advised that the presentation should tie in other components of the JWC meeting and also show the relationship between the BINS study and the Binational Programming and Planning study.
- Regarding the JWC's vote on the Proposed Resolutions:
  - Lisa Dye [Federal Highway Administration] expressed the need to adequately prepare JWC members for the upcoming Resolution vote. Several members do not have Technical Committee representation and are not aware of the BINS study or the upcoming vote on the Proposed Resolutions. A memo describing the situation will be sent by SourcePoint to the JWC coordinators, Sylvia Grijalva [Federal Highway Administration] and Oscar Ringenbach [Mexican Secretariat of Communication and Transportation]. Sylvia and Oscar will then brief the JWC members about the course of the BINS project and the vote on the Proposed Resolutions at the JWC meeting.



## **Follow-up**

- The BINS team will prepare an executive summary and a PowerPoint Presentation by the next JWC preparation meeting (July 2) for review.
- SourcePoint will produce and send a memo to update JWC members [only those who do not have Technical Committee representation] about the vote on the Proposed Resolutions July 10-11.

## **Attendees – At Meeting**

California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Sergio Pallares

SourcePoint

- Marney Cox
- Santiago Davila
- Amir Masliyah
- Michael Williams

U.S. Federal Highway Administration

- Lisa Dye

## **MINUTES FROM THE SOURCEPOINT – CALTRANS: JWC PREP MEETING #2 CONDUCTED JULY 2, 2003**

### **Goals of Meeting**

The purpose of the meeting: To prepare for the Joint Working Committee on July 10-11 in Mexico City. The attendees will review the handouts created by SourcePoint and critique Marney Cox's [SourcePoint] PowerPoint presentation.

### **Discussion**

- Regarding the handouts for the JWC meeting:
  - On the "READ ME" handout, the title to the Transportation Project Folder will be changed to reflect its relationship to the Corridor Evaluations. Also, the word "carpeta" will be changed to "archivo". One binder of Corridor Evaluations will be left at the JWC meeting in Mexico City for review.
- Regarding Executive Summary and PowerPoint presentation:
  - The BINS team will verify what brought about the creation of the JWC; Sergio Pallares [Caltrans] suggested it came out of a FHWA Memorandum of Understanding titled "Operating Guidelines".
  - Slides two and three will switch spots in the presentation, and the information in the "Background" slide will be discussed with the "Study Area" slide. Using the "Study Area" slide, the map will eventually fade and the study's objectives will come to the forefront and be discussed.
  - The "Reaching Consensus" slide will be put in front of the "Methodology" slide, and the "Consensus" slide will focus less on a timeline and more on the spirit of consensus and what was agreed to. This slide will also include a brief summary about the composition of the Technical Committee for the JWC's clarification.
  - On the "Relationship with Other JWC Projects" slide, the bullet "GIS Mapping" will be changed to "BGIS Mapping". Slide eight will be taken out, and the slide with New Mexico's map will then be in front of the "Relationship" slide.
  - The "Expected Products" slide will be re-crafted in a way that aligns these products with the initial objectives of the study. The bullet "planning processes" will be deleted, and the bullets "maps" and "transportation project database" will be switched.
  - The slides that deal with the Vote on the Proposed Resolutions will be moved to the end of the presentation, and a high level summary of the 11 step process will be integrated into the presentation (in between the "Resolution #1" slide and "Resolution #2" slide).
  - The "Accomplishments" slide will be merged with the "Expected Products" slide. The bullet points about Texas' truck data and "minor modifications" will be taken out of the "Work To Do" slide. On this slide, the bullet point "project analysis" will be inserted.

## **Follow-up**

- The BINS team will make the necessary changes to the executive summary and PowerPoint Presentation, and CD's will be made.
- All travel and logistical arrangements will be coordinated in advance of the July 10-11 JWC Meeting in Mexico City.

## **Attendees**

### California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Trent Clark
- Jose Ornelas
- Pedro Orso
- Sergio Pallares

### SourcePoint

- Marney Cox
- Santiago Davila
- Amir Masliyah
- Michael Williams

### U.S. Federal Highway Administration

- Lisa Dye

## **MINUTES FROM THE SOURCEPOINT – CALTRANS MEETING CONDUCTED JULY 29, 2003**

### **Goals of Meeting**

The purpose of the meeting: To critique the Table of Contents for the BINS California Draft Report created by SourcePoint; to discuss the creation of maps; and to review the approval process for the BINS final report.

### **Discussion**

- Regarding the JWC meeting in July:
  - The possibility of extending the contract for BINS into a Phase II was discussed. This Phase II would further develop the corridor identification methodology and it would incorporate factors such as environmental concerns, safety concerns, and net economic benefits. The issue of disparity between corridor characteristics (i.e. AADT) was also discussed.
- Regarding the BINS Draft Report:
  - The section on 'Differences Between US & Mexican Transportation Planning' will be reviewed by the appropriate government organizations for approval. Information on transportation 'Programming' will also be incorporated into this section.
  - There was discussion about the possibility of creating a funding category for all of the projects that have NO cost figures. These projects would be interpreted as projects that require an initial investment for planning and development.
  - On the 'Needs Assessment of Border Region & Infrastructure' section, the word 'Municipios' will be introduced as a way of representing the counties south of the border.
  - On the 'Needs Assessment of Border Region & Infrastructure' section, the word 'Municipios' will be introduced as a way of representing the counties south of the border. SourcePoint will create a section under the 'Background & the BINS Project' to discuss the economic benefits of trade among the border region. SourcePoint will also put emphasis in the creation of the Executive Summary. This summary will explain, in great detail, the major categories that make up the BINS project, including the major findings, the corridor evaluations, U.S and Mexican Federal Legislation, and funding opportunities. It was suggested that the Executive Summary should be able to 'stand alone'.
  - Under the 'Project Funding Opportunities' section, a section on 'Major disconnects between the Mexican and U.S. planning processes' will be added after each country's planning process is explained.
  - The 'Legislative Provisions' sections will deal with topics like: Revenue allocation among the border region, homeland security, border technologies, and the possible creation of a 'trust fund' in Mexico that would be used to pay for transportation projects.
- Regarding the California Draft Report:
  - The title of the report will read 'California/Baja California Report'. The topic on differences in corridor definition and interpretation between Baja and California will be addressed as an initiative, from both states, to acknowledge these differences and the willingness from

both states to work around these separate views to encourage continuous binational planning efforts.

- Under the section 'Major Finding from the Corridor Evaluations', the word 'Compare' will not be used; instead, the title will read 'California and Baja California Corridors'.
- In general, the California/Baja California Report will concentrate on topics that explain, with great detail, the differences between each state's planning and programming processes. This report will also investigate issues dealing with local funding mechanisms, detail highway data analysis, and any other type of information that can provide a clear view of the border transportation infrastructure in both border-states.
- Regarding Mapping:
  - SourcePoint will review the POE maps to make sure that the Mexican POE names are correct. SourcePoint will study the possibility of attaching numbers to the POEs and then providing names to these numbers on a separate legend.
  - Caltrans is in the process of creating cargo/trucks distributions maps within California and from California to the other states. Caltrans is interested in including these maps in the California/Baja California report.
- Regarding Process of Approval of the Final Report:
  - SourcePoint will contact the state technical representatives during the week following September 18th in order to collect comments and answer any questions that may arise. SourcePoint will also mail courtesy draft reports to Lisa Dye and Sylvia in September 18.

## **Follow-up**

- SourcePoint will write a letter to Caltrans requesting an extension of the BINS project contract until June 2004. The current contract expires December 2003 but the JWC meeting is scheduled for February 2004, therefore, an extension is needed to accommodate the next JWC meeting.
- SourcePoint will send the 'Differences between US & Mexican Transportation Planning' document to Oscar Ringenbach (SCT) for review and comment.
- SourcePoint will obtain a copy of the SCT's presentation at the July 10 JWC meeting in Mexico City.
- SourcePoint will contact Roger Petzold in order to obtain a map that shows the corridors connecting U.S. with Canada and Mexico.
- Caltrans will provide SourcePoint with the contact information for Dennis Linskey who has a Map containing the proper locations of all POE on the US-Mexico border. Once SourcePoint has Mr. Linskey's coordinates, SourcePoint will contact him and request a copy of the map so it can be used in the BINS report.
- Caltrans will review and provide feedback on a few of the maps created for the BINS report.

## **Attendees**

### California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Trent Clark
- Sergio Pallares

### SourcePoint

- Marney Cox
- Santiago Dávila
- Michael Williams

### Baja California

- Carlos López

## **SOURCEPOINT – CALTRANS/BGIS MEETING MINUTES**

### **Dates:**

December 16, 2002

August 1, 2003

## **MINUTES FROM THE SOURCEPOINT – CALTRANS/BGIS MEETING CONDUCTED DECEMBER 16, 2002**

### **Goals of the Meeting**

The main goal of this meeting is for BGIS [Bi-National Border Geographic Information System] to give a project status update to the BINS committee.

- Regarding the BGIS project:
  - Diane Pierzinski, the BGIS project manager [California Department of Transportation-Caltrans], began the meeting by stating that the main objective of the BGIS project is to create an interactive GIS structure for the border region (10 border-states). Diane [Caltrans] explained that there are two main applications that will develop from the BGIS project:
    - 1) An application where the border data will become available to the public in a web format. This application will provide some kind of technical assistance and can be used by the general public, planners etc.
    - 2) A more detailed application that can be used in conjunction with the BINS project. BGIS will create a mode/spatial-location relationship that will be used, later on, by the BINS team for different project tasks (i.e. plotting and selecting projects).
- Regarding project deadline and BINS clarification:
  - Diane mentioned that she hoped to have the BGIS project completed by OCTOBER 2003.
  - The University of New Mexico has joined the BGIS project, helping in the revision of border layer data across the entire border.
  - Diane's perspective of the BINS project was that projects and their spatial location were the main objectives. BINS explained that projects were a subset of the most important task, which is the spatial location of corridors along the border.
- Regarding BGIS project obstacles:
  - Diane mentioned that she has not received a great deal of cooperation from south of the border. She is hoping that each of the six Mexican border-states will provide the conversions needed for the already existing layer data. In conjunction with the U.S. data, this data will be used for the creation of the BGIS structure.
  - Diane pointed out that all ten border-states have agreed on a similar Identification format for airports, seaports, POEs, and railroads. However, each state has a different identification format for highways and roads, making it difficult to form a unified relationship for the data across all ten border-states.
  - Also, providing technical assistance to the Mexican states for the collection of GIS data doesn't seem to be part of the BGIS scope of work.
  - Diane mentioned the possibility that Mexican data will come from the federal government. She pointed out that individual border-states look up to the federal government when asked to release data for the BGIS project. This can present a problem since the federal government tends to have a different perspective/objective compared to the individual border-states in the development of transportation infrastructure.



## **Follow-up**

- Diane Pierzinski will provide SANDAG with the developments of the BGIS project.
- Michael Williams will provide Mark Woodall with Arizona project data.

## **Attendees**

### California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Trent Clark
- Maurice Eaton
- Barbara Kent
- Chad Lambirth
- Sergio Pallares
- Diane Pierzinski

### SourcePoint

- Marney Cox
- Santiago Dávila
- Michael Williams

### San Diego Association of Governments [SANDAG]

- Steve Kunkel
- Mark Woodall

## **MINUTES FROM THE SOURCEPOINT – CALTRANS/BGIS MEETING CONDUCTED AUGUST 1, 2003**

### **Goals of Meeting**

The main goals of the meeting are the following:

- To explore the existing BGIS [Binational Border Geographic Information System] and BINS databases and review their compatibility
- To better understand the current mapping capabilities of BGIS.

### **Discussion**

- Regarding the BGIS Databases:
  - Mathew Rich [New Mexico State] reported that there are missing GIS attributes with both the US and Mexican GIS data. However, all of the problems and missing attributes are "solvable".
  - New Mexico State is waiting for funding from the Federal Highway Administration to extend the BGIS project to the entire border region. Mathew Rich and New Mexico State are currently working only for the New Mexico Department of Transportation.
- Regarding the BINS Databases:
  - The BINS corridor database consists of a series of questionnaires, all of which are Excel spreadsheets. The spreadsheets for each state are not linked together in a way that allows the data to be used by GIS software.
  - There is also a transportation project related database, and this data is contained in Excel spreadsheets.
  - Mathew Rich described the need to reformat this data into a form that can be utilized by GIS. He also pointed out that geographical representation of the post miles would be helpful in plotting project data.
- Regarding Mapping:
  - SourcePoint will send the Excel spreadsheets to Mathew Rich after the completion of the BINS project.
  - The BGIS project will convert the Excel spreadsheet into a GIS-usable data set.
  - Lisa Dye [FHWA] will speak with Adrian Apodaca [New Mexico Technical Committee Representative] about this contract add-on.
  - Mathew Rich [NM State] will review the area maps presented by SourcePoint and provide comments and suggestions.

### **Follow-up**

- SourcePoint, Caltrans, and New Mexico State will remain in contact in the coming months as future plans to connect BINS and BGIS continue to take shape.
- Because GIS mapping of the Border States is not available from BGIS, BINS mapping will be done by artists at SourcePoint.

## **Attendees**

### California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Sergio Pallares

### SourcePoint

- Marney Cox
- Santiago Dávila
- Michael Williams

### San Diego Association of Governments [SANDAG]

- John Hofmockel
- Steve Kunkel
- Mark Woodall

### U.S. Federal Highway Administration

- Lisa Dye

### New Mexico State University

- Mathew Rich

## **BINS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETINGS MINUTES**

### **Dates:**

November 19, 2002

April 30, 2003

May 16, 2003

June 13, 2003

November 21, 2003

## **MINUTES FROM THE BINS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING CONDUCTED ON NOVEMBER 19, 2002**

### **Goals of the Meeting**

- The goal of the meeting is to develop a systematic methodology that uses quantifiable criteria to identify major transportation corridors. Ultimately, the systematic and quantifiable process may be used in the reauthorization of TEA 21 funds. To be used in this manner, the states along the US-Mexico border need to agree on a set of criteria and a methodology to assess the transportation corridors. If successful, this approach may help ensure a leadership role for states in the funding reauthorization process. The main goal of this meeting, then, is for the Technical Committee to APPROVE the process of arriving at a methodology to select corridors

### **Discussion**

- Regarding the differences between transportation planning and programming between Mexico and the United States:
- Sergio Pallares [California Department of Transportation – Caltrans] stated that there is a highway transportation fund that pays for highway projects in the US, while in Mexico there is none. He wants to include this difference in the planning and programming process section of the BINS report.
- Carlos Lopez [Baja California Secretaría de Asentamientos Humanos y Obras Públicas – SAHOPE] commented that in the past few years, Baja California has tried to participate in the process of decentralizing planning as they had the opportunity to implement federal projects, however, they did not receive funds to implement the projects. Consequently, they were obligated to return the projects to the federal government.
- Joaquin Barrios [Chihuahua Secretaría de Comunicaciones y Obras Públicas – SCOP] added that his state government has many disputes with the federal government because they want to build highways, however, the federal government does not allow it.
- Regarding project level data:
- Arnold Burnham [Arizona Department of Transportation – ADOT] stated that the Arizona State Transportation Improvement Plans [STIPs] concentrate specifically on big projects, without taking into account the need for maintenance of roads, which uses a significant portion of the annual budget.
- Larry Warner [US General Services Administration – GSA] stated that the GSA manages land Ports of Entry [POE] along the US-Mexico border. It was suggested that the POE should be included when studying the prioritization of projects and transportation needs.
- Regarding privatization:
- Arnold [ADOT] stated that Arizona has tried it but it has not worked well because there are many alternative corridors.
- Carlos [SAHOPE] stated that Baja California knows of many projects that have potential for privatization, but the federal legislation does not allow them to implement the process. The issues are the amount of ownership and investment the federal and state governments should have in these types of projects.

- Claude Cortez [México Secretaría de Comunicaciones y Transportes – SCT] stated that there are rules and legislation for ownership and construction of projects that do not allow for these types of agreements. States want to put money into certain highway projects, but they also want to receive some of the revenue coming from those highways (toll revenue), creating financial disagreements between levels of government.
- Regarding Corridor Analysis:
  - Marney [SourcePoint] stated that SourcePoint will gather different criteria to evaluate corridors. However, the main objective of this meeting is to APPROVE the process of arriving at a methodology to select corridors. Marney pointed out the need to receive more US and Mexican studies that will provide additional guidance for developing the methodology.
  - Marney [SourcePoint] reminded the committee that a technical memo would be sent by SourcePoint to the Technical Committee listing relevant studies and providing a recommend list of criteria.
  - Claude [SCT] stated that the evaluation of corridors is usually done using a systematic methodology [95% of the time]; however, in a few cases [5% of the time] political issues dominate. The corridor between Mazatlan and Nuevo León is an example where political factors dominated. He also said that Mexico has a problem developing East-West corridors since there is not enough trade to support them. However, they need them. Consequently, he wants to introduce some criteria to make sure it supports the idea of East-West corridors.
  - Joaquin [SCOP] stated that Chihuahua has North-South corridors but does not have East-West corridors. He made a point that Chihuahua needs more East-West corridors due to its large geographical area.
  - Sergio [Caltrans] pointed out that the data for the criteria should come from each state.
  - Arnold [ADOT] stated that when the ADOT analyzes corridors, they gather special information on that corridor instead of relying on the Highway Performance Monitoring System [HPMS] database.

**Sergio [Caltrans] proposed a resolution on a process to identify major transportation corridors.** This “procedure” consists of:

- Identifying different studies that used “quantifiable” criteria.
- Comparing and identifying “common points” among the studies.
- Using the common points from the studies as the basis for the BINS CORRIDOR EVALUATION CRITERIA to be approved by the JWC with recommendation from the BINS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE.

**The Technical Committee approved this resolution.**

- Regarding project evaluation
  - Arnold [ADOT] also stated that they have tried the Highway Economic Requirements System [HERS] and it didn’t work – most likely because they used it for secondary roads, not highways. Further, Arizona’s rapid development does not make highway project evaluation fit well with the HERS model framework.
  - Mark Baza [Caltrans] also mentioned they would not be in support of using HERS. They wanted to use data more directly related to the criteria agreed on.
  - Oscar Ringenbach [SCT] stated that the Mexican government uses a model similar to HERS for evaluating projects. They would also like to see the structure of HERS in order to

compare it with their model. Oscar also mentioned that the software program has been used by the World Bank and it is a cost-benefit analysis only used for highway projects.

**The committee agreed on having the corridor data stored in EXCEL Spreadsheets.**

## **Follow-up**

- SourcePoint will distribute the Framework for completing the BINS project to all the members of the BINS Technical Committee [**see Attachment 1**].
- SourcePoint will send a Technical Memorandum to the Technical Committee listing relevant studies & providing a recommend list of corridor criteria [**to be sent February 28, 2003**].
- SourcePoint will establish a meeting with Caltrans for December 5, 2002 to review main points for the Joint Working Committee meeting [**completed**].
- Arizona will send SourcePoint a flow chart describing the transportation planning process in Arizona [**received**].
- The SCT requested a copy of the HPMS table of contents in order to understand the type of data available in HPMS. Upon further discussion, it became clear that a number of agencies were interested in this, therefore, it is being sent to all the Technical Committee members [**see Attachment 2**].
- The SCT mentioned that they have a database that may contain information similar to what is contained in the HPMS database and they said they would provide a copy of this to SourcePoint.
- Arizona will send SourcePoint a study that compares HERS with other types of analysis [**received**].
- The SCT will send SourcePoint information on the model used to evaluate projects.
- December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting with Caltrans to review Marney's presentation to the JWC [**completed**].
- Draft BINS report for December meeting of Joint Working Committee [**completed**].
- Joint Working Committee meeting, December 12 & 13, 2002, Baltimore, MD [**completed**].

## **Attendees**

### California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Sergio Pallares

### SourcePoint

- Marney Cox
- Santiago Davila
- Michael Williams

### San Diego Association of Governments

- Elisa Arias
- Hector Vanegas

### Arizona Department of Transportation

- Arnold Burnham

### Secretaria de Infraestructura y Desarrollo Urbano del Estado, SIDUE (ex-SAHOPE), BAJA CALIFORNIA

- Carlos López

Secretaria de Comunicaciones y Obras Públicas [SCOP], Chihuahua

- Joaquín Barrios

México Secretaria de Comunicaciones y Transportes [SCT]

- Claude Cortez
- Oscar Ringenbach

U.S. Federal Highway Administration

- Lisa Dye
- Sylvia Grijalva

US General Services Administration

- Larry Warner



## **MINUTES FROM THE BINS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING CONDUCTED ON APRIL 30, 2003**

### **Goals of Meeting**

To obtain *opinions and suggestions* from the BINS Technical Committee on several proposed resolutions and a completed corridor evaluation for Arizona – the first of 10 states that will be conducted along the US-Mexico border.

### **Discussion**

- Regarding the Recommendation to the Joint Working Committee:
  - This meeting will be the first of three meetings that will occur during the next two months. During these meetings we will review the corridor evaluations for each state.
  - During the last meeting we will ask the Technical Committee to approve the resolutions. After the Technical Committee approves the resolutions, we will then recommend those resolutions to the Joint Working Committee in July 2003.
  - SourcePoint received tentative approval to proceed knowing that a final decision will not be made until June.
  - Regarding the Proposed Resolutions # 1 and # 2:
  - SourcePoint presented the corridor evaluation example with no questions, suggestions, or comments from any representative.
  - The reason there are more indicators in the border corridor selection criteria than in the actual corridor evaluation is because it was not possible to obtain all the criteria initially listed; therefore we used the data provided by most of the states.
  - CALTRANS pointed out that we have not received any data from Coahuila and Sonora. Currently SourcePoint is allowing an extension (May 9<sup>th</sup>) for those states that want to provide any missing data.
  - SourcePoint received tentative approval to proceed using the methodology (11-step process) and the criteria, knowing that a final decision will not be made until June.
- Regarding the Corridor Evaluation for Arizona:
  - For the analysis of Arizona, the format of the results is that which will be used for all the border-states.
  - SourcePoint received tentative approval to proceed using the Arizona Corridor Evaluation – keeping in mind that there will be changes made to the format.
  - Sonora expressed concern with the possibility that they may only have one corridor for their evaluation. SourcePoint reassured Sonora that a one corridor analysis did not decrease the efficiency of the results of the evaluation.
- Regarding the Database System Plan:
  - One of the main purposes of creating the database system plan is to allow each state to maintain its own set of data and its own corridor evaluation tool.
  - SourcePoint is in the process of creating corridor evaluation tools for each of the 10 states. This tool will be in the form of an Excel spreadsheet and will contain each state's unique

attributes [highways, airports, corridors, etc.]. While each tool uses the same methodology, the attributes and complexity will vary by state.

- SourcePoint will send each state the evaluation tool when it is complete. Each state can then conduct its own evaluation using the tool, and it can conduct the evaluation at its discretion.

## **Follow-up**

- Texas will be sending additional data before the May 9th extension.
- SourcePoint will email the Technical Committee members details of the May 16 meeting as we distribute the corridor evaluations for California, Baja, New Mexico, and the revised version for Arizona. The meeting will take place in San Diego, CA, and the same conference call format will be used.
- SourcePoint will be requesting specific transportation project information from each of the border-states. This data will need to be turned in before the third corridor evaluation meeting with the Technical Committee in June.
- The next Joint Working Committee meeting is schedule for July 10-11 in Mexico City.

## **Attendees – At Meeting**

California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Sergio Pallares

SourcePoint

- Marney Cox
- Santiago Davila
- Amir Masliyah
- Michael Williams

San Diego Association of Governments

- Elisa Arias
- Hector Vanegas

Secretaria de Infraestructura y Desarrollo Urbano del Estado,  
SIDUE (ex-SAHOPE), BAJA CALIFORNIA

- Carlos López

U.S. Federal Highway Administration

- Lisa Dye
- Sylvia Grijalva

## **Attendees – On the Telephone**

Texas Department of Transportation

- Mary Deleon
- Fred Márquez

Secretaría de Urbanismo y Obras Públicas del Estado, COHUILA

- Adela Blanco
- Francisco Samora

Secretaria de Infraestructura Urbana y Ecológica (SIUE), SONORA

- Héctor García

Secretaria de Comunicaciones y Transportes (SCT), MEXICO CITY

- Oscar Ringenbach

## **MINUTES FROM THE BINS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING CONDUCTED MAY 16, 2003**

### **Goals of Meeting**

To obtain *opinions and suggestions* from the BINS Technical Committee on the following:

- Changes to the discussion portion of the proposed resolutions.
- The revised Arizona corridor evaluation and corridor evaluations for California, New Mexico and Baja California.

The second goal is to establish the date for the June BINS Technical Committee meeting.

### **Discussion**

- Regarding the Status of the BINS Project:
  - SourcePoint emphasized that the BINS project is a logical extension of Phase IV of the Binational Border Transportation Study.
  - Coahuila provided data to supplement the data compiled by SourcePoint's, but Sonora provided no data whatsoever. As of May 16, there has been full participation from all the U.S. states and participation from five of the six Mexican [Sonora provided no data].
- Regarding the changes to the discussion section of the Proposed Resolutions:
  - There were no changes made to the proposed resolutions and two minor wording changes to the discussion. The first change clarifies the number of indicators used for the land ports of entry evaluation [four corrected to five]. And in Step 10, text was changed to clarify how corridors are listed based on their scores.
- Regarding the Revised Corridor Evaluation for Arizona:
  - SourcePoint outlined the format changes to the Arizona evaluation, and the Arizona representatives gave their approval of these changes. Thus, SourcePoint has completed the corridor evaluation for Arizona. Arizona will receive one additional week (a total of three weeks) to review the final version of the Arizona corridor evaluation.
- Regarding the Highway Summary and Corridor Evaluation for New Mexico:
  - This section composed a large portion of the meeting. SourcePoint reviewed both documents in detail to ensure that the Technical Committee members understood the methodology for estimating weighted averages for AADT, capacity, and Level of Service.
  - SourcePoint will provide an additional week (three weeks total for review) to allow New Mexico to examine the final version of the New Mexico Corridor Evaluation and provide questions or comments.
- Regarding the Baja California Corridor Evaluation:
  - The Baja California corridor evaluation contains one more page than the other evaluations because additional space was needed for eleven corridors.

- The evaluation will be re-computed without allocation of truck traffic to the Central Camionera Garita corridor. A different road is used by trucks to enter the Otay Mesa POE, and this road will be created and integrated as a twelfth corridor.
- Regarding the California Highway Summary and Corridor Evaluation:
  - The California Corridor Evaluation was reviewed but the California Highway Summary was not reviewed because the methodology and layout are identical to the New Mexico Highway Summary. There are minor errors that will be corrected.

## **Follow-up**

- The next Technical Committee meeting will be held June 13th in San Diego, CA, and the same conference call format will be used.
- During this meeting, SourcePoint will request that the Technical Committee formally approve the proposed resolutions.
- SourcePoint is expecting transportation project information from each of the border-states to be submitted by May 30, 2003.
- The next Joint Working Committee meeting is scheduled for July 10-11 in Mexico City.

## **Attendees**

### California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Sergio Pallares

### SourcePoint

- Santiago Davila
- Amir Masliyah
- Michael Williams

### San Diego Association of Governments

- Elisa Arias

### Secretaria de Infraestructura y Desarrollo Urbano del Estado, SIDUE (ex-SAHOPE), BAJA CALIFORNIA

- Carlos López

### U.S. Federal Highway Administration

- Lisa Dye

## **Attendees – On the Telephone**

### Arizona Department of Transportation

- Lupe Harriger

### New Mexico Department of Transportation

- Adrian Apodaca

### United States Federal Highway Administration

- Sylvia Grijalva

## **MINUTES FROM THE BINS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING CONDUCTED JUNE 13, 2003**

### **Goals of Meeting**

There are two goals for the meeting: to vote on and approve the Proposed Resolutions, and to review the corridor evaluations for the following states: Texas, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuevo León, Tamaulipas, Sonora, and Baja California (revised). Lastly, the attendees will discuss the Joint Working Committee meeting slated for July 10-11.

### **Discussion**

- Regarding the Status of the BINS Project:
  - SourcePoint reported that the BINS project is on schedule according to the timeline laid out by the Framework. Each state's corridor evaluation has been completed, and final approval for four of the evaluations has been obtained [as of June 23, final approval has been received for all ten states except Texas, Tamaulipas, and Chihuahua. Texas and Chihuahua are awaiting final approval, and the revised evaluation for Tamaulipas will be sent out by Wednesday, June 25]. SourcePoint expects to have all 10 evaluations finalized by the first week of July.
  - In early May, the BINS team requested a list of transportation projects from all ten states, as well as GIS coordinates for the projects. [As of June 23, Nuevo León is the only state that has not yet provided transportation project data].
- Regarding the JWC Meeting in July:
  - A PowerPoint presentation describing the BINS study will be delivered at the Joint Working Committee meeting in July. SourcePoint will also provide the final versions of all the corridor evaluations on a CD ROM, and a listing of all the transportation projects along the border region.
- Regarding the Vote on the Proposed Resolutions:
  - There are two Proposed Resolutions that deal with the evaluation of transportation corridors. The first is an 11 step corridor evaluation procedure methodology, and the second deals with the criteria to be used in this 11 step methodology.
  - There are eleven parties eligible to vote on the Resolutions. There is one vote for each of the ten states, and one vote for the Mexican Secretariat of Communications and Transportation [SCT]. All eleven voting representatives approved the Resolutions in written form prior to the meeting. During the conference call, nine of the eleven parties approved the Resolutions with an oral confirmation; Nuevo León and Sonora were absent.
- Regarding the Corridor Evaluation for Texas:
  - SourcePoint outlined the General Description and Analysis of the Texas Corridor Evaluation, and presented major modifications that will be made. The Texas representative gave her approval of these revisions and agreed to the time frame for approving the Final Version of the Texas Evaluation [Friday, June 27th].

- Regarding the Corridor Evaluation for Chihuahua:
  - SourcePoint outlined the General Description and Analysis of the Chihuahua Corridor Evaluation, and presented minor modifications that will be made. The Chihuahua representative gave his approval of these revisions and agreed to the time frame for approving the Final Version of the Chihuahua Evaluation [Wednesday, June 25th].
- Regarding the Coahuila Corridor Evaluation:
  - SourcePoint outlined the General Description and Analysis of the Coahuila Corridor Evaluation. There were no modifications. The Coahuila representative agreed to the time frame for approving the Final Version of the Coahuila Evaluation [Friday, June 20th].
- Regarding the Nuevo León Corridor Evaluation:
  - SourcePoint outlined the General Description and Analysis of the Nuevo León Corridor Evaluation. There were no modifications, and the Nuevo León representative was not present to agree to the time frame for approving the Final Version of the Nuevo León Evaluation [Friday, June 20th].
- Regarding the Tamaulipas Corridor Evaluation:
  - SourcePoint outlined the General Description and Analysis of the Tamaulipas Corridor Evaluation, and presented major modifications that will be made. The Tamaulipas representative gave his approval of these revisions and agreed to the time frame for approving the Final Version of the Tamaulipas Evaluation [Monday, June 23rd].
- Regarding the Sonora Corridor Evaluation:
  - SourcePoint outlined the General Description and Analysis of the Sonora Corridor Evaluation. There were no modifications, and the Sonora representative was not present to agree to the time frame for approving the Final Version of the Sonora Evaluation [Friday, June 20th].
- Regarding the Baja California Corridor Evaluation [revised]:
  - The Final Version of the Baja California Corridor Evaluation was accepted by the Baja California Technical Committee Representative.

## **Follow-up**

- The BINS team will be preparing for the next Joint Working Committee meeting scheduled for July 10-11 in Mexico City.
- Lisa Dye [Federal Highway Administration] will coordinate with Robert Czerniac at New Mexico State University in an attempt to obtain Mexican GIS data for the BGIS project.
- Oscar Ringenbach [Mexican Secretariat of Communication and Transportation] will provide Mexican Port of Entry project data, and this list will be verified with CABIN [Comisión de Avalúos de Bienes Nacionales].
- Michael Williams will interview Larry Warner of the General Services Administration to obtain a listing of projects planned at the US Ports of Entry along the US-Mexico border.

## **Attendees – At Meeting**

California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]

- Mark Baza
- Sergio Pallares

SourcePoint

- Santiago Davila
- Amir Masliyah
- Michael Williams

San Diego Association of Governments

- Elisa Arias
- Héctor Vanegas

Secretaria de Infraestructura y Desarrollo Urbano del Estado, SIDUE (ex-SAHOPE), BAJA CALIFORNIA

- Carlos López Rodríguez

U.S. Federal Highway Administration

- Lisa Dye

Mexican Secretariat of Communication and Transportation

- Oscar Ringenbach

## **Attendees – On the Telephone**

Arizona Department of Transportation

- Arnold Burnham

New Mexico Department of Transportation

- Adrian Apodaca

Texas Department of Transportation

- Mary DeLeon
- Alfredo Marquez

Secretaría de Urbanismo y Obras Públicas del Estado, Coahuila

- Adela Blanco

Secretaría de Urbanismo y Obras Públicas del Estado, Chihuahua

- Joaquín Barrios

Secretaría de Urbanismo y Obras Públicas del Estado, Tamaulipas

- Ernesto Delgado



## **MINUTES FROM THE BINS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING CONDUCTED NOVEMBER 21, 2003**

### **Goals of Meeting**

There are two goals for the meeting:

- To review summary of suggestions and comments on BINS draft final draft report
- To review the votes on the proposed resolution

Lastly, the attendees will discuss next steps and JWC meeting on February, 2004.

### **Discussion**

- Regarding the Status of the BINS Project:
  - SourcePoint reported that the BINS report is on its final stage of review. Once the Technical Committee approves the report, then a final copy will go to the JWC.
  - SourcePoint will implement all changes, comments, and suggestion on the BINS final draft report provided by the Technical Committee. Before this, SourcePoint will create a matrix (see matrix below) that would list all comments and suggestions, as well as SourcePoint's responses to them. This document will enable all states to review their comments and approve their implementation.
- Regarding the JWC Meeting in February, 2004:
  - A PowerPoint presentation describing the status of the BINS study will be delivered at the Joint Working Committee meeting in February.
- Regarding the Vote on the Proposed Resolutions:
  - There is one proposed resolution where the Technical Committee reviews the final draft of BINS, and tentatively approves the draft for the JWC's approval and acceptance for distribution.
  - There are eleven parties eligible to vote on the Resolutions. There is one vote for each of the ten states, and one vote for the Mexican Secretariat of Communications and Transportation [SCT]. Seven representatives approved the Proposed Resolution, while three of them required more discussion. One of them did not present their vote.
- Regarding the Comments from Tamaulipas:
  - SourcePoint presented Tamaulipas' comments and suggestions. The representative from this state wasn't able to attend the conference call.
- Regarding the Comments from Chihuahua:
  - SourcePoint presented Chihuahua's comments and suggestions. The representative from Chihuahua agreed that it was necessary that all other suggestions were implemented in order to have a full approval from his state.

- Regarding the Comments from Nuevo León:
  - SourcePoint did not received any comments or suggestions from the technical representative. There is also a new technical representative and his name is Oscar Herrera. This state was the only state that did not provided.
- Regarding the Comments from Coahuila:
  - SourcePoint presented the comments and suggestions from Coahuila. There were no additional comments from this state.
- Regarding the Comments from Sonora:
  - SourcePoint did not receive any comments or suggestions from the technical representative.
- Regarding the Comments from Texas:
  - SourcePoint presented the comments and suggestions from Texas. Mary DeLeon wanted more time to review the final draft. She also wanted to know if she could provide additional project data, in order to improve the analysis.
- Regarding the Comments from New Mexico:
  - SourcePoint presented the comments and suggestions from New Mexico. Adrian wanted to correct some of the corridor data in order to maintain continuity with Texas' corridors.
- Regarding the Comments from Arizona:
  - SourcePoint did not receive any comments or suggestions from the technical representative.
- Regarding the Comments from Baja California:
  - SourcePoint presented the comments and suggestions from Baja California. Carlos Lopez would like to resolve some data inconsistencies with the SCT.
- Regarding the Comments from California:
  - SourcePoint presented the comments and suggestion from California. Caltrans provided detailed comments in written and text form. SourcePoint will work closely with Caltrans in order to implement these changes.
- Regarding the Comments from SCT and FHWA:
  - SourcePoint presented the comments and suggestions from the SCT and the FHWA. Sylvia provided oral and written comments during the meeting. The SCT would like to discuss some data inconsistencies with Baja California.

## **Follow-up**

- The BINS team will develop a matrix (see below for matrix) with all the comments and suggestions. During the time it takes to develop the matrix, states can provide further comments and revisions. Once the matrix is mailed out, no more comments or suggestions will be allowed. The changes will be implemented and a copy of the report will be mailed out to the representatives.
- The states of New Mexico and Texas would let us know the outcome of the discussion about corridor and the continuity of these from state to state. The state of Baja California and the SCT will resolve some POE project issues and inform us their decision.

- December 3rd is the last day states can turn in suggestions or comments on the BINS report.

## **Attendees – At Meeting**

### California Department of Transportation [CALTRANS]

- Mark Baza
- Sergio Pallares
- Trent Clark
- Beth Landbam

### SourcePoint

- Santiago Davila
- Elisa Arias
- Marney Cox

### San Diego Association of Government

- Héctor Vanegas

### U.S. Federal Highway Administration

- Lisa Dye

### Mexican Secretariat of Communication and Transportation

- Oscar Ringenbach

## **Attendees – On the Telephone**

### Arizona Department of Transportation

- Lupe Harriger

### Texas Department of Transportation

- Mary DeLeon

### New Mexico Department of Transportation

- Adrian Apodaca

### Texas Department of Transportation

- Mary DeLeon
- Alfredo Marquez

### Secretaría de Urbanismo y Obras Públicas del Estado, COHUILA

- Adela Blanco

### Secretaría de Urbanismo y Obras Públicas del Estado, Chihuahua

- Joaquín Barrios

### U.S. Federal Highway Administration

- Sylvia Grijalva

## BINS

### Matrix of Comments Received on Draft Final BINS Reports and Proposed Responses

<b><u>Comment No.</u></b>	<b><u>State/ Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Comment/Suggestion</u></b>	<b><u>SourcePoint's Response</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
1.	Arizona	Arizona did not provide any comments or suggestions on the draft final reports.	No response needed.	X
2.	Baja California	Baja California requested a revision the Port of Entry (POE) Project table (page 27) of the Executive Summary. One of the projects (Las Americas) was not recognized by the state government of Baja California and another POE project was missing.	SourcePoint proposes to eliminate the table from the Executive Summary because several states found the POE table confusing (i.e., it did not clearly explain the relation between U.S. and Mexican projects) and there is not sufficient information to describe the projects.	X
3.	Baja California	Baja California and SCT sent a table with POE projects to revise the table included on page 626 of the appendices.	SourcePoint will update the table in the appendix.	X
4.	California	California likes the logo but is concerned about the distortion of the national flags and requested SourcePoint check with the Mexican Consulate.	SourcePoint verified that artistic flags have been used at events co-sponsored by the Mexican Consulate and no issues were raised.	X
5.	California	California would like to introduce the concept that Border Departments of Transportation (DOTs) are bearing most of the responsibility for improving a transportation infrastructure that serves international trade which benefits national economies (on pages 3-5 of the executive summary). TEA-21 additional funding was not enough.	SourcePoint request concurrence on this statement from the BINS Technical Representatives prior to including it in the BINS report.	X
6.	California	California pointed out that on Footnote 3; Mexican primary federal highways run north-south and do not begin and end in Mexico City.	SourcePoint will correct this footnote.	X
7.	California	California would like the Executive Summary to more specifically address the study purpose and the objectives (page 5), as clearly as possible.	SourcePoint will restructure the Executive Summary and provide a revised copy to the BINS Technical Committee for review.	X
8.	California	California would like the objectives (page 5 of Executive Summary) to be numbered for easier identification.	SourcePoint will make this change.	X

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>State/ Organization</b>	<b>Comment/Suggestion</b>	<b>SourcePoint's Response</b>	<b>Status</b>
9.	California	California would like the following changes applied to the objectives: a. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Objective would read "To establish a <b>live binational</b> border-wide database....to evaluate <b>current and new</b> transportation corridors and <b>projects</b> ..." b. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Objective, substitute "identify" by " <b>consolidate</b> " c. Add two additional objectives: 5th Objective: "To identify current and projected funding needs in the binational border-wide region". 6th Objective: "To provide a binational border-wide tool for the JWC to update the future assessment of transportation infrastructure at the border region."	SourcePoint will clarify the language of the objectives. Under objective No. 2, the objective was to evaluate transportation corridors but not projects.	X
10.	California	California mentioned that the conclusions (page 10) need to highlight impacts of the trade and population data introduced to the border transportation infrastructure. Issues like increase in cross-border delays, impacts on infrastructure and state/local dots budgets, environmental impacts, etc.	SourcePoint will review and revise that section.	X
11.	California	California would like to delete or provide more substantive comments on the first paragraph of the Background section (page 12 of the Executive Summary).	SourcePoint will reword the paragraph.	X
12.	California	California questioned the use of highlighting, at the Executive Summary level (pages 17 and 18) some facts about the corridors, which appear to be irrelevant.	SourcePoint will restructure the Executive Summary and remove some of the detailed information.	X
13.	California	California asked what the criteria are for a corridor to be included in BINS (page 13).	SourcePoint will move up the criteria (within 100km of the border and serve a POE), which is listed in the second paragraph.	X
14.	California	California asked if there were criteria for a "project" to be included in BINS (page 21).	SourcePoint included these criteria in the first paragraph, but will highlight it (...significant projects on major transportation corridors	X

<b><u>Comment No.</u></b>	<b><u>State/ Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Comment/Suggestion</u></b>	<b><u>SourcePoint's Response</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
			planned for the next 20-years).	
15.	California	California requested to create a graph of the type of information provided in page 21 of the Executive Summary (paragraphs 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> , and 4 <sup>th</sup> ).	SourcePoint will restructure the Executive Summary and evaluate providing additional graphics.	X
16.	California	California mentioned that on page 12 and others, relative numbers should be inserted in a parenthesis following the absolute numbers.	SourcePoint will consolidate absolute numbers and percentages as appropriate.	X
17.	California	California requested to highlight the level of effort of border DOTs and local agencies to fund border infrastructure, and maybe compare it to the level of dedicated funding received.	SourcePoint will update Table 2 (page 29) to provide federal dedicated funding allocations for 1999-2003, instead of 2001 only. The BINS project did not compile historical information on state and local agencies funds provided for border transportation projects.	X
18.	California	California mentioned that pages 21 to 24 are the heart of BINS. This section needs more detail and information and it needs to be easier to read.	SourcePoint will present identified funding needs based on the data provided by the states for projects on key corridors in the Overview of the Border Region section. SourcePoint will move that information to the beginning of the U.S. and Mexico sections for additional clarity.	X
19.	California	California pointed out that the POE table (page 27) needed to be revised.	SourcePoint proposes to eliminate the table from the Executive Summary because several states found the POE table confusing (i.e., it did not clearly explain the relation between U.S. and Mexican projects) and there is not sufficient information to describe the projects.	X
20.	California	California mentioned that the way information is presented (page 28) is weak. Funding is not top down; it is by National-State formula (Highway Trust Fund). States and MPOs decide funding priorities.	SourcePoint will review and revise as appropriate.	X

<b><u>Comment No.</u></b>	<b><u>State/ Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Comment/Suggestion</u></b>	<b><u>SourcePoint's Response</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
21.	California	California requested to know why BINS concentrated on CBI-NCPD for the year 2001 only. They requested to see the entire funding picture.	SourcePoint will update Table 2 (page 29) to provide federal dedicated funding allocations for 1999-2003, instead of 2001 only.	X
22.	California	California mentioned that the General Conclusions should further summarize and reiterate what has been said so far.	SourcePoint will review and revise the General Conclusions in order to satisfy the suggestions presented.	X
23.	California	California believed this section (page 6, Executive Summary, Organization of the Report) could be condensed.	SourcePoint will review the text and will make changes accordingly.	X
24.	California	California pointed out that (page 9 of the Executive Summary) annual trade by truck and rail in 2002 accounted for \$192 billion, while on page 7, the text says annual trade in 2002 was \$232 billion.	SourcePoint did not implement any changes because the figures on page 9 are for <u>truck and rail only</u> , as specified. The figure on page 7 is TOTAL ANNUAL TRADE.	X
25.	California	California suggested that pages 16 through 20 should be summarized and graphs should be included.	SourcePoint will look into this and changes will be implemented.	X
26.	California	California mentioned that the municipios (counties) of Rosarito and Ensenada should be included in Map 2 on page 10.	Map 2 only shows municipios that are adjacent to the U.S./Mexico border. No change is needed.	X
27.	California	California requested that Map 3, page 11, shows the San Ysidro and Otay Mesa POE names listed in order from west to east.	SourcePoint will implement this change.	See Lori
28.	California	California pointed out that the study report on page 16 indicates a total of \$190 billion while page 10 presented a total of \$170 billion for U.S.-Mexico trade in 2000.	The figures on page 16 (\$190 billion) include both truck and rail trade, while the total on page 10 (\$170 billion) represents truck trade only, as indicated in the text. No change is needed.	X
29.	California	California mentioned that the study report was too technical. California requested to eliminate some numerical analyses and consolidate the information.	SourcePoint will review and revise sections of the report to improve readability.	X
30.	California	California would like the "Steps Employed to Achieve Consensus" (Page 32 of the study report) be moved to an Appendix.	SourcePoint will summarize the steps in the report.	X

<b><u>Comment No.</u></b>	<b><u>State/ Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Comment/Suggestion</u></b>	<b><u>SourcePoint's Response</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
31.	California	California pointed out that the information is duplicated on pages 51 and 52 of the study report.	Page 51 provides the analysis for Current Conditions while page 52 provides the analysis for Projected Change. No change is needed.	X
32.	California	California provided a more detailed map with the description of California's two corridors.	SourcePoint will use this map to enhance the map in the report.	X
33.	Chihuahua	Chihuahua requested a correction in the length of the airport runways (page 56 of the main report).	SourcePoint will correct the length of the runways appropriately.	X
34.	Chihuahua	Chihuahua requested corrections to the state's corridor map (page 57 of the main report). Chihuahua requested consistency in the names of the corridors on the state map and the text.	SourcePoint revised the corridor names in the map and will send it by e-mail to Chihuahua for review.	X
35.	Coahuila	Coahuila asked why the Piedras Negras and the Acuña airports were not shown on the map of major seaport and airport facilities.	SourcePoint explained to the technical committee representative from Coahuila that data on those two airports were not provided. Only those airports where data were provided were included in the corridor analysis of the states.	X
36.	Coahuila	Coahuila pointed out a mistake in the spelling of Piedras Negras in the reports.	SourcePoint will correct the misspellings.	X
37.	Coahuila	Coahuila requested the name of the El Melon – La Linda corridor be changed to Boquillas del Carmen – Múzquiz.	SourcePoint will change the name of the corridor wherever it applies.	X
38.	New Mexico	New Mexico requested the data collected to be made more complete. The technical representative felt that there were many indicators that were missing data and other indicators that could be introduced in the evaluation.	SourcePoint evaluated the data that was provided by the New Mexico technical representative. Additional data was requested, but it was not provided. The methodology, the indicators and corridor evaluation were approved by New Mexico on June 23, 2003 and by the JWC on July 10, 2003.	X



<b><u>Comment No.</u></b>	<b><u>State/ Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Comment/Suggestion</u></b>	<b><u>SourcePoint's Response</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
39.	New Mexico	New Mexico pointed that corridors within the study need more continuity; as some states chose only a few corridors, while other states chose many corridors.	The corridor selection methodology approved for the BINS project called for each state to identify its own transportation corridors, based on approved selection criteria.	X
40.	New Mexico	New Mexico pointed out that the database created for the BINS study is not compatible with the Border GIS (BGIS) project.	SourcePoint recognizes that both databases are not compatible. The BGIS study began after the BINS database had been created.	X
41.	New Mexico	New Mexico would like to replace the text (page 596) of the appendices to read "Governor Richardson's Investment Partnership."	SourcePoint will implement this change.	X
42.	New Mexico	New Mexico would like to delete the project (page 596 of appendices): "NE Parkway Loop, 4-lane divided highway 2015."	SourcePoint will implement this change.	X
43.	New Mexico	New Mexico would like to replace the following text (page 354 of appendices): Reword the 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence. It currently reads: "It is envisioned that a new land POE will open about five miles east of Santa Teresa at Sunland Park around 2020." to say the following: "The City of Sunland Park is proposing a new, non-commercial POE to be opened about five miles east of Santa Teresa." New Mexico would also like to delete the following sentence: "The primary role for this new POE is the movement...."	SourcePoint will implement these changes.	X
44.	New Mexico	New Mexico would like to reword the first sentence (page 355 of the appendices): Delete "plan" and replace with "proposal". It would read: There is a proposal to move the rail crossing that currently crosses the international boundary between downtown Juarez, Mexico and El Paso, Texas to the Santa Teresa POE in New Mexico. New Mexico would also like to reword the 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence to read: This is proposed to occur during the next 20 years.	SourcePoint will implement these changes.	X

<b><u>Comment No.</u></b>	<b><u>State/ Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Comment/Suggestion</u></b>	<b><u>SourcePoint's Response</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
45.	Nuevo Leon	Nuevo Leon did not provide any comments or suggestions on the draft final reports.	No response needed.	X
46.	Sonora	Sonora did not provide any comments or suggestions to the BINS project team.	No response needed.	X
47.	Tamaulipas	Tamaulipas requested the Port of Entry (POE) Project table (page 27) of the Executive Summary be revised. The list of POE projects did not represent the correct projects recognized by the state.	SourcePoint proposes to eliminate the table from the Executive Summary because several states found the POE table confusing (i.e., it did not clearly explain the relation between U.S. and Mexican projects) and there is not sufficient information to describe the projects.	X
48.	Tamaulipas	Tamaulipas requested to discuss the location of the Nuevo Leon corridor. Tamaulipas mentioned that the Nuevo Leon corridor passed through Nuevo Laredo, in Tamaulipas, before connecting to Monterrey.	SourcePoint revised Map17 to show highway MX-2 and MX-85 on the Nuevo Laredo corridor in Tamaulipas. In the State of Nuevo León, the Monterrey-Colombia corridor includes highway NL-01 only.	X
49.	Tamaulipas	Tamaulipas pointed out that the map in the Executive Summary that shows the major seaport and airport facilities did not include the port of Mezquital, on the Gulf Coast of Tamaulipas.	SourcePoint will revise the map to include the port of Mezquital.	X
50.	Tamaulipas	Tamaulipas pointed out a few discrepancies with the state corridor map (page 70 of the main report). Most of the discrepancies dealt with color coding of the transportation corridors.	SourcePoint implemented the changes to the map and will send it by e-mail to Tamaulipas for review.	X
51.	Texas	Texas asked why there were so many blank spaces on the Port of Entry (POE) Project table (page 27) of the Executive Summary.	SourcePoint proposes to eliminate the table from the Executive Summary because several states found the POE table confusing (i.e., it did not clearly explain the relation between U.S. and Mexican projects) and there is not sufficient information to describe the projects.	X

<b><u>Comment No.</u></b>	<b><u>State/ Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Comment/Suggestion</u></b>	<b><u>SourcePoint's Response</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
52.	Texas	Texas requested corrections to the description of land POEs (Page 73 of the report and page 496 of the appendices). No busses or passenger vehicles cross through Stanton or the World Trade Bridge POEs.	SourcePoint will make these corrections.	X
53.	Texas	Texas requested the heading "Project Data Issues" (page 96) of the report be clarified so it does not appear that they were Texas' project data issues.	SourcePoint will change the heading to "BINS Data Issues Related to Projects."	X
54.	Texas	Texas requested the report (page 73) and the appendices (page 496) mention that Tex Mex railroad interchanges with TFM at Laredo II POE. They also requested to add a comment to the fact that the Presidio POE rail crossing will re-open in 2004, which may potentially affect rail traffic at El Paso POE.	SourcePoint will add this information.	X
55.	Texas	Texas requested to revise the International Bridge and Border Crossing Map (in the Executive Summary). Revise #29 Dolores (Solidarity) to read Laredo Colombia (Solidarity); revise #31 Laredo (Convent Street) to read Laredo (Gateway to Americans Bridge); and revise #21 Tornillo to read Fabens (Tornillo Application is still in the Presidential Permit process).	For all states, SourcePoint is using the international bridge and border crossing names recognized by DOS/CILA. Texas revisions will be shown in parentheses.	X
56.	Texas	Texas requested to add a sentence to the 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph (page 95) explaining that Texas' listing of funded and non-funded projects, that are identified, reflect short term projects through 2006 and do not represent 20 years of unfunded projects.	SourcePoint will add this sentence to the report.	X

<b><u>Comment No.</u></b>	<b><u>State/ Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Comment/Suggestion</u></b>	<b><u>SourcePoint's Response</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
57.	Texas	Texas submitted a funded project list as requested, but did not submit a non-funded project list for the following reason: Texas was told that in addition to the GIS database creation, the non-funded projects were to be used as a master list for the JWC to select a pilot project to be funded as part of the Innovative Finance Project. At this point, TxDOT made a decision that the project submitted by Texas was to be selected and nominated by TxDOT's Administration.	SourcePoint has included the project list provided by Texas in the BINS project.	X
58.	Texas	Texas felt that the evaluation criteria concerning corridor selection was unclear. As the project moved forward, Texas had questions concerning the project methodology.	The evaluation criteria was reviewed (at the Technical Committee meeting on June 13, 2003) and approved by the Texas Technical Committee representative on June 27, 2003; and by the JWC on July 10, 2003. The evaluation criteria may be updated in future phases of the BINS project.	X
59.	FHWA	FHWA recommended the word "prosperity" be changed to "economic benefit" or similar (page 3 of Executive Summary, 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph).	SourcePoint will implement this change.	X
60.	FHWA	FHWA would like to include the Mexican perspective in the text (page 4 of the Executive Summary under the Background section).	SourcePoint will obtain background information from Mexican representatives to incorporate into this section.	X
61.	FHWA	FHWA commented on page 4 of the Executive Summary under the Background section – The DOS and SRE should be included as members of the JWC.	SourcePoint will implement this change.	X
62.	FHWA	FHWA commented on page 12 of the Executive Summary under Background section, first paragraph – the last two sentences should be eliminated.	SourcePoint will implement this change.	X

<b><u>Comment No.</u></b>	<b><u>State/ Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Comment/Suggestion</u></b>	<b><u>SourcePoint's Response</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
63.	FHWA	FHWA commented on page 12 of the Executive Summary under Background section, last paragraph – beginning at fourth sentence – this portion should be eliminated or rewritten because it is incorrect.	SourcePoint will review and revise this paragraph.	X
64.	FHWA	FHWA commented on page 21 of the Executive Summary – 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph – the sentence that begins “This provides an indication...” Either eliminate or reword it or take it where conclusions are discussed.	SourcePoint will implement this change.	X
65.	FHWA	FHWA commented on page 28 of the Executive Summary – under Traditional Financing Sources in the US – Last two sentences should be reworded clearly stating the States responsibility and FHWA's responsibility.	SourcePoint will implement this change.	X
66.	FHWA	FHWA commented on page 29 of the Executive Summary – under Border and Corridor Grant Opportunities – Last sentence should be eliminated.	SourcePoint will implement this change.	X
67.	FHWA	FHWA commented on page 30 of the Executive Summary – first sentence should be eliminated.	SourcePoint will implement this change.	X
68.	FHWA	FHWA commented on page 30 & 31 of the Executive Summary – under the Innovative Financing section – that this section is repetitive.	SourcePoint will revise to eliminate repetitive text.	X
69.	FHWA	FHWA commented that on page 31 of the Executive Summary the footnote is confusing. Suggested the following: Werner Frederick, FHWA “U.S./Mexico Joint Working Committee Innovative Finance team FY 2004 Work Plan Products”, July 10, 2003.	SourcePoint will implement this suggestion.	X
70.	FHWA	FHWA commented on page 111 of study report – first paragraph – Reword the second sentence to reflect the fact that FHWA and the other agencies are part of the DOT.	SourcePoint will implement this change.	X
71.	FHWA	FHWA commented on page 111 of study report – 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph – second sentence – the USDOS is responsible for the permitting process in the US,	SourcePoint will make this change.	X

<b><u>Comment No.</u></b>	<b><u>State/ Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Comment/Suggestion</u></b>	<b><u>SourcePoint's Response</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
		not for planning the locations of border crossings.		
72.	FHWA	FHWA commented overall that the Executive Summary should be more concise and to the point. It should clearly state what the findings are for the study. FHWA recommended that once the comments are incorporated and the executive summary is revamped, that the report be redistributed for review.	SourcePoint will restructure the Executive Summary and provide a revised copy to the BINS Technical Committee for review.	X
73.	FHWA	FHWA commented that more emphasis needs to be made on the results, the next steps and the usability of the product.	SourcePoint will restructure the Executive Summary and provide a revised copy to the BINS Technical Committee for review.	X
74.	FHWA	FHWA commented that Chapter 4 of the study report seems a bit wordy. FHWA believes that the chart provided in the Appendix is easier to understand, even though this chart doesn't answer the following: 1) The corridor to which the projects belong, 2) Where the funding is coming from, 3) What type of projects we are talking about (new roads, increased capacity, etc)	SourcePoint will review Chapter 4 and make changes accordingly. Project data submitted to SourcePoint varied substantially from state to state and not all information requested by SourcePoint was provided.	X
75.	FHWA	FHWA doesn't believe that a repeat of the AADT increasing for every state (under each list of state projects) is relevant to the discussion in Chapter 4 of report	SourcePoint will review those sections and eliminate repetitive AADT data.	X
76.	FHWA	FHWA commented that when a Mexican entity is referenced in the text, it should be presented (first instance) as English translation (actual name/acronym). Chapter 5 needs these revisions.	SourcePoint will implement these changes.	X
77.	FHWA	FHWA mentioned that in Chapter 5, it makes more sense to discuss each country's planning process before comparing the planning processes. FHWA found it to be a bit repetitive.	SourcePoint will make this change.	X

<b><u>Comment No.</u></b>	<b><u>State/ Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Comment/Suggestion</u></b>	<b><u>SourcePoint's Response</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
78.	FHWA	FHWA commented that more of the information contained in Chapter 6 of the study report should be incorporated in the Executive Summary.	SourcePoint will add more information from Chapter 6 into the Executive Summary.	X
79.	FHWA	FHWA would like the four main objectives of the study to say: 1) Develop an evaluation process and procedure to identify corridors – how was this done? 2) To establish a border-wide database that can be used. 3) To identify projects – beyond numbers of projects, what are the projects? New roads? Added capacity? 4) To identify funding	SourcePoint will clarify the language of the objectives.	X
80.	FHWA	FHWA would like the following issues to be discussed in the Executive Summary: 1) The evaluation process was good and was accepted by all 10 states – a very large accomplishment. 2) What does the database looks like? 3) What is the limitation of the database? 4) Is the format compatible with GIS? 5) If not, how can this be overcome? 6) How will the database be maintained? 7) How are projects going to be maintained? 8) What are some of the legislative changes that could be made that will assist funding? 9) What are some of the innovative ways to fund?	SourcePoint will restructure the Executive Summary to address these suggestions, based on available data.	X
81.	FHWA	FHWA mentioned that the Executive Summary is too wordy and too general. It should discuss issues such as: 1) Will this process help decision makers decide where to fund? 2) Can I identify the first ranked corridor for each state, find projects on that state and make decisions?	SourcePoint will restructure the Executive Summary to address this comment.	X

<b><u>Comment No.</u></b>	<b><u>State/ Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Comment/Suggestion</u></b>	<b><u>SourcePoint's Response</u></b>	<b><u>Status</u></b>
		3) How do I use the BINS project and database?		
82.	FHWA	FHWA would like to define the term "Major Seaports and Airports" and "Major Railroads" on page 13 of the Executive Summary.	SourcePoint will provide these definitions.	X
83.	FHWA	FHWA would like to see the distribution of CBI and NCPD money for the years 2002 and 2003 also (Table 2, page 29 of the Executive Summary).	SourcePoint has obtained data from 1999 through 2003 and will update Table 2.	X
84.	SCT	The SCT believes that the criteria for the evaluation of corridors need to be more selective.	SourcePoint concurs that additional criteria would be beneficial. However, the criteria for the evaluation of corridors were approved by the technical representatives in June 2003 and by the JWC in July 2003. Changes could be implemented in a future phase of BINS.	X

X = completed